



JOHN ENGLER

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Thomas D. Watkins, Jr., Chairman

DATE: August 6, 2002

SUBJECT: Report on Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

On July 1, 2002, the United States Department of Education released a listing of the number of Title I schools Identified for Improvement in each state in the United States. A report on adequate yearly progress is prepared annually at the beginning of each school year based on adequate yearly progress data from the previous school year. Michigan will be preparing its annual adequate yearly progress report for the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year, which will result in a new list of Title I schools being Identified for Improvement.

During the previous reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, each State was required to develop a measure of adequate yearly progress. The Michigan formula for determining adequate yearly progress was developed by the Title I Committee of Practitioners, which was comprised of teachers, administrators, school boards members, and parents from across Michigan. The State Board of Education, based on the recommendation of the Title I Committee of Practitioners, adopted the formula that is described in Attachment A. The Michigan formula for adequate yearly progress has been calculated and reported to schools since 1998.

Both the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 specify that schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years will be identified for "Improvement." While the No Child Left Behind Act requires annual assessments and measures of adequate yearly progress in reading and mathematics, Michigan has conducted the assessments and applied the adequate yearly progress formula to reading, mathematics, science, and writing. Michigan schools have been identified for Improvement if they fail to make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years in any one of the four subject areas.

The requirements and definition of adequate yearly progress in the No Child Left Behind Act are much more specific than in the previous legislation. Although states will not be required to implement all of the adequate yearly progress requirements until they have received assessment data for the 2002-2003 school year, Michigan will begin the alignment with the federal

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS - PRESIDENT • SHARON L. GIRE - VICE PRESIDENT
MICHAEL DAVID WARREN, JR. - SECRETARY • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER - TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE - NASBE DELEGATE • JOHN C. AUSTIN • HERBERT S. MOYER • SHARON A. WISE

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov • (517) 373-3324

requirements using assessment data from the 2001-2002 school year. For Michigan's own purposes, adequately yearly progress will continue to be measured and reported for reading, mathematics, science, and writing. All schools will continue to be expected to make progress in all four-subject areas.

Within the list of 1,513 schools, the range of student achievement is vast. Some schools have fairly high achievement scores and barely miss making adequate yearly progress in a single subject; others are struggling in several areas and in multiple grade levels. Just as additional financial resources, grants, and technical assistance are targeted to schools with the greatest needs, so, too, will identification of Title I schools for "Improvement" status – for purposes of alignment with the No Child Left Behind Act – be focused on buildings with a greater need for improvement.

Therefore, the identification of Title I schools for "Improvement" status will be based on reading and mathematics. The No Child Left Behind Act defines the process for setting a target achievement objective for each subject. This statewide target objective is to be set initially at the achievement level of the lowest 20 per cent of achievement scores for each subject area. The achievement objective will then be increased systematically over 12 years to the level of the ultimate goal of all students achieving proficiency. Schools are considered to have made adequate yearly progress if their results are at or above these achievement levels, or if they meet their improvement target under Michigan's existing formula. The process for establishing the achievement goals for determining adequate yearly progress, as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act, will be implemented for the 2002-2003 school year.

Attachment

Revised Definition of Adequate Yearly Progress for Title I Schools

A Title I school will meet the definition of adequate yearly progress if its Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) or High School Proficiency Test (HSPT) results for each subject area tested show that the school has closed at least 10 percent of its achievement gap each year. A school's status will be determined separately for each subject area tested by the MEAP/HSPT.

The achievement gap for each school will be the total of:

- 1) the difference between the current percentage of students scoring in the highest achievement category and the ideal of 100 percent; and
- 2) the difference between the current percentage of students scoring in the lowest achievement category and the ideal of 0 percent.

Example A	Percent In	Percent In
<u>Year</u>	<u>Highest Category</u>	<u>Lowest Category</u>
1	53%	18%
2	56%	14%

Year 1 Total Achievement Gap = 47 (100 - 53) + 18 (18 - 0) = 65

Gain Target for Year 2 = 10% x 65 = 6.5%

Actual Gain in Year 2 = 7% (3% in highest category plus 4% in lowest category)

Adequate Yearly Progress? Yes

Example B	Percent In	Percent In
<u>Year</u>	<u>Highest Category</u>	<u>Lowest Category</u>
1	47%	24%
2	49%	21%

Year 1 Total Achievement Gap = 53 (100 - 47) + 24 (24 - 0) = 77

Gain Target for Year 2 = 10% x 77 = 7.7%

Actual Gain in Year 2 = 5% (2% in highest category plus 3% in lowest category)

Adequate Yearly Progress? No

If a major change in a MEAP or HSPT test prevents meaningful comparison for a particular year, that year will be used as Year 1 for a new comparison cycle.

NOTE: The Title I legislation includes a provision that exempts schools from having to meet the definition of adequate yearly progress if "almost every student" in the school is achieving in the highest category. This threshold will be determined and established as part of the revised accreditation standards under Section 1280 of the Revised School Code.